

Date: Tue, 20 Sep 94 04:30:12 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #454
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 20 Sep 94 Volume 94 : Issue 454

Today's Topics:

 Built first rig? (was Re: Facts Speak volumes)
 CW as a language?
 Facts Speak volumes
 Get Over It
 Manual vs Machine Code sending
 PRB-1 IGNORED!!! (2 msgs)
 Tech+ vs. Tech printed on lic?
 Transmitter Sale to Non-Amateur?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 13 Sep 1994 22:39:23 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!bengal.oxy.edu!acsc.com!wp-sp.nba.trw.com!
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!lll-winken.llnl.gov!korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!
abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Built first rig? (was Re: Facts Speak volumes)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 94Sep13145414@urth.eng.sun.com, rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard
McAllister) writes:
>In article <3546ee\$kpa@cat.cis.Brown.EDU> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P.
Deignan) writes:
>
>>Feasible? Oh, I'd probably say every country SSB is feasible from. Likely?
>>That's a different story.
>

>Why is it when I read one of those DXpedition stories in QST, I
>often find some mention that the DXpeditioner worked CW because
>CW was rare from that place, because all the natives just worked SSB?

Heh-heh.

>The cheapest/easiest way to get on from remote places is not going to be
>homebrewing. It's tough tracking down parts even in electronics-heavy areas
>of the USA. Sure, QRP CW transmitters can be about the simplest circuits
>that actually do something. But they're useless without a receiver. (Where
>*is* Gary Coffman?) A usable HF receiver doesn't get built as somebody's
>first project out of old TVs that washed up on the beach. And if a receiver
>shows up, what a surprise - the CW receiver works for SSB too. Given that
>our hypothetical ham from Lower Slobbovia is going to have to scratch up a
>surplus or commercial receiver, getting a transceiver doesn't seem that much
>harder.

Richard is absolutely correct. Just because it is easier to build a CW transmitter than an SSB transmitter doesn't make a lot of difference; building a decent receiver is about the same work for both, and is more work than building a transmitter for either. I recall saying something about this recently, in regard to the "CW makes homebrewing possible" thread, but I'm not certain I made it clear in a post to the group.

>A question: who here built their *first* rig (assembling a high-quality kit
>doesn't count)? Or even knows of somebody who did, within the last 30 years
>or so?

Oh, I did. My first contact, as a Novice, was made using a 1W transmitter I built. I'd bought the transmitter PC board, partially completed, at the local club auction for \$.50. I went to the local library, found the QST article that described it, saved up the cash to buy the toroids and other required parts, and got the transmitter built. It was non-trivial effort. My receiver was built from a kit, a Realistic Glober Patrol super-regen, but I'm not sure it counts as a "high-quality" kit :-).

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

*

Date: Thu, 15 Sep 94 18:01:13 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!sgiblab!pacbell.com!amdahl!netcomsv!netcomsv!skyld!

jangus@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW as a language?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

CW is a language. I keep hearing this consistant whining in the background about CW being some form of universal language.

For example I hear things like, "QSL OM, UR 59 LA, FB TNX FER QSO." This is not a language. This is no more learning a language than having your dog respond to sit, stay, or walkies.

If the deal is to have a "universal" language to communicate with others, then the FCC should drop the CW requirement and instead require a proficiency in Esperanto.

Obviously a message will fall on deaf ears if it is in the wrong language.

In international business the most widely used languages are:

English followed by Spanish.

On an actual basis of number of people speaking it:

Chinese. The Chinese government stresses a tri-lingual approach. Mandarin, a local dialect and English.

73 es GM from Jeff who will go back to laying under his dashboard and talking to his buddies by sending Morse Code with the stripped mic wires.

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM	"You have a flair for adding
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com	a fanciful dimension to any
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749	story."
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080	Peking Noodle Co.

Hate "Green Card Lottery"? Want to help curb ignorant crossposting on Usenet?
E-mail ckeroack@hamp.hampshire.edu for more information, or read news.groups.

Date: 13 Sep 1994 21:54:14 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!bengal.oxy.edu!acsc.com!wp-sp.nba.trw.com!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!
lll-winken.llnl.gov!korie!male.EBay.Sun.COM!engnews1.Eng.Sun.COM!
engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!usenet@ihnp4.ucsd.edu
Subject: Facts Speak volumes
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <3546ee\$ka@cat.cis.Brown.EDU> md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>Feasible? Oh, I'd probably say every country SSB is feasible from. Likely?
>That's a different story.

Why is it when I read one of those DXpedition stories in QST, I often find some mention that the DXpeditioner worked CW because CW was rare from that place, because all the natives just worked SSB?

The cheapest/easiest way to get on from remote places is not going to be homebrewing. It's tough tracking down parts even in electronics-heavy areas of the USA. Sure, QRP CW transmitters can be about the simplest circuits that actually do something. But they're useless without a receiver. (Where *is* Gary Coffman?) A usable HF receiver doesn't get built as somebody's first project out of old TVs that washed up on the beach. And if a receiver shows up, what a surprise - the CW receiver works for SSB too. Given that our hypothetical ham from Lower Slobbovia is going to have to scratch up a surplus or commercial receiver, getting a transceiver doesn't seem that much harder.

A question: who here built their *first* rig (assembling a high-quality kit doesn't count)? Or even knows of somebody who did, within the last 30 years or so?

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: Mon, 19 Sep 94 13:15:21 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Get Over It
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I have been peering into the cesspool that rec.radio.amateur.policy has become lately, and find it fascinating that the "code vs no-code" argument is still in full bloom! Get over it. You have a fine amateur radio service which affords you a HUGE chunk of spectrum without a

morse code proficiency requirement. If you want to work HF bands, you study some theory, some regs, some manual morse, and away you go. If you can't learn CW, I mean if you have a handicap, the regulations allow for this. Get a waiver. Otherwise learn the code.

Many of the hams who grabbed the No-Code end of incentive licensing are now offended that they may have to learn code! Well, that is the way it is. The question of pirate and unauthorized operation is big enough, without having to figure "is that an "Advanced Phone" licensed ham or just an "Advanced"?

If you are irrational, stop reading now

As much as i hate to agree with J. Herman, CW is allowed from band-edge to band-edge, and not knowing CW on the HF bands is not a good idea. Besides, how would you know when you were being called a lid for calling CQ over an ongoing QS0? But Jeff, the simplicity of CW gear is not a justification for CW profociency. We should be looking to make complicated designs accessible through education. Building a 30 year old circuit, many times over, is not furthering the technical state-of-the-art.

I have not even seen one (though i admit to having been avoiding this group for a while) attempt to organize a proposal for a rule change. Like the ones that got incentive licensing and the codeless-tech going.

I posted the original "CW is....History" with the intent of watching the frenzy as the respective sides tried to ignore the fact that it is a very old method of encoded communication. Not as old as VOICE, but pretty old. I like the idea of bandplan modifications to give some elbow room to HF Digital. And the Phone subbands (ahhhhhhhh....sweet, soothing, band-plan) seem to have the room to spare. Additional segments would alleviate the crowding and expansion of the current allocations.

One big wake-up call has been the CW-ists noticing the extent of digital allocations in "their" areas. Notably 14030-ish. So if a few phone nets get washed out, or a cw qso has to move up a few... it is a hobby, not a Land-Grab.

Enough Pontificating, i will let you get back to bickering, hopefully keeping you lids off of the air!

n1qdg

Date: Thu, 15 Sep 94 18:03:10 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!sgiblab!pacbell.com!amdahl!netcomsv!netcomsv!skyld!
janguis@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Manual vs Machine Code sending
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

"Real men do it with it their hands."

73 es GM from Jeff, OCWA #25779

```
Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM | "You have a flair for adding
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com          | a fanciful dimension to any
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749       | story."
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080                     | Peking Noodle Co.
```

Hate "Green Card Lottery"? Want to help curb ignorant crossposting on Usenet? E-mail ckeroack@hamp.hampshire.edu for more information, or read news.groups.

Date: 18 Sep 1994 08:49:10 -0700
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
news.sprintlink.net!primenet!stat!david@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: PRB-1 IGNORED!!!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

From: Clark Savage Turner <turner@safety.ICS.UCI.EDU>
Subject: Re: PRB-1 IGNORED!!!
Date: 18 Sep 1994 08:49:10 -0700
Organization: UC Irvine Department of ICS
Message-ID: <35hnhm\$bhhv@safety.ics.uci.edu>

In <Cw7BnK.Gs2@freenet.buffalo.edu> au831@freenet.buffalo.edu (James B. Laughlan Jr) writes:

>Subject: PRB-1 IGNORED!!!

>attended the public hearing and stated to the board the existence of
>FCC document PRB-1 which gives amateur radio stations a complete and
~~~~~  
>total exemption from any tower law. They also stated that the ruling



From: billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl Budd Lake)  
Subject: Re: PRB-1 IGNORED!!!  
Date: 19 Sep 1994 03:27:33 GMT  
Organization: Planet Access Networks - Stanhope, NJ  
Message-ID: <35j0f5\$8ef@jupiter.planet.net>

James B. Laughlan Jr (au831@freenet.buffalo.edu) wrote:  
Originally-To: au831@freenet.buffalo.edu (James B. Laughlan Jr)  
Subject: Re: PRB-1 IGNORED!!!  
Newsgroups: rec.radio.info,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy  
Organization: Planet Access Networks - Stanhope, NJ

In article <Cw7BnK.Gs2@freenet.buffalo.edu> you wrote:  
: Date: Fri, 16 Sep 1994 02:45:19 GMT  
: Don Burrows K02J Communications officer for the Niagara County R.A.C.E.S.  
: attended the public hearing and stated to the board the existence of  
: FCC document PRB-1 which gives amateur radio stations a complete and  
: total exemption from any tower law.

Jim, be careful here. PRB-1 is not so broadsweeping. PRB-1 states there should be a balance between the interests of the governing body (i.e. the zoning requirements) and those of hams. If the antenna tower limit was going to be anything over 50 feet or so, you'd have a tough time fighting it from what I've read before in other cases around the USA.

Remember too, you want to win the war, your best course of action is to work WITH the city council, not against it. Ask yourself what would be reasonable for most local hams? 50 foot, 60?

: They also stated that the ruling  
: has been successfully defended in both state and federal courts.

But, unfortunately, not always. If the city attorney does some research, the attorney may uncover the cases that have gone favorably for high restrictions. Be careful here.

: The  
: response from Councilman Michael Curtis was "ask us for an amendment,  
: don't sue us". Town attorney Edward Jeand that PRB-1 needed to be looked  
: at closer to see if he could recommend  
: the amendment. The board also stated that there was no intention to  
: restrict hams at all and there needed to be a law on the books to protect  
: the town after a recent 3 year battle with a local radio station WTOR  
: which at first proposed to the town to place 3 AM radio towers along  
: Langdon Road in the Town of Lewiston. There was a long battle only to  
: have it settled in N.Y.S. Supreme Court in favor of the radio station,



: which plans to run 5000 watts directed into Canada after the Canadian  
: D.O.C. denied him a license. As of this time, Attorney for the town  
: Edward Jesella is reviewing PRB-1 to see if any changes could be necessary.

This is encouraging. Work with the attorney for the city and the city council. Don't take an adversarial position. They have said that hams are not the problem. How high was the proposed AM antenna towers? Would a height limit lower than the AM tower height be agreeable?

I'm both a councilman in my home town (Mount Olive Township, NJ) and an ARRL Local Government Liaison. Let me give you some inside perspective on elected officials...they all have egos a mile wide, they want to play the politically safe thing to do. Show them that you want to work with them and you have a far better chance of succeeding than trying immediately to go to court. By going to court you threaten their entire position (i.e. their opposition to the AM towers). Why not suggest that any tower limit not apply to residentially zoned areas. That is, the limit should be one of a commercial zoning area only (the AM towers would certainly be a commercial endeavor and require their placement only in a commercial zone IMHO).

Again, TRY to work with the city, not against. I can't stress that enough. Be right in principle and losing the battle isn't something you want to see happen.

If you wish to discuss this by telephone, please don't hesitate to call me: Home 201-691-8116 evenings, Office 201-829-2879 days

--

Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.net)  
Budd Lake, New Jersey

-----

Date: Tue, 13 Sep 1994 18:30:45 GMT  
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!news.csuohio.edu!shien.ist.csuohio.edu!  
mike@ames.arpa  
Subject: Tech+ vs. Tech printed on lic?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Got my Tech+ in Jan, '94, a few months before FCC started actually printing "Technician Plus" on the license if you passed your 5WPM CW. My license of course only says "Technician". Can I resubmit my CSCE for 5WPM CW and get a new license printed "Technician Plus", but NOT lose the original callsign? All I'm after is a license printed with "Technician Plus".



Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM | "You have a flair for adding  
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com | a fanciful dimension to any  
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749 | story."  
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080 | Peking Noodle Co.

Hate "Green Card Lottery"? Want to help curb ignorant crossposting on Usenet?  
E-mail ckeroack@hamp.hampshire.edu for more information, or read news.groups.

-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Sep 1994 06:11:00 EST  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!  
dan@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Cw77yx.81M@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <35g7a1\$47s@jupiter.planet.net>,  
<CwB7K2.7sK@news.Hawaii.Edu>  
Subject : Re: Maritime CW vs Ham CW

jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>In article <35g7a1\$47s@jupiter.planet.net> billsohl@earth.planet.net (Bill Sohl  
Budd Lake) writes:

>

>>If the emphasis today still involved CW ship-to-ship and ship-to-shore  
>>emergency communications, then why has the US Coast Guard abandoned  
>>its training of new radio operators for CW skills?

>

>\$\$\$\$. Same reason the Coast Guard uses Air Force uniforms and Navy  
>second-hand radio equipment: \$\$\$.

EXACTLY! You admit that the "cost of the mode" must also include the  
training of the person using it. Thank you Jeff!

>Aside from that, \*all\* commercial coastal maritime stations in the US  
>are still monitoring 500 kc, as are all maritime nations other than  
>the US. Send ``CQ CQ CQ DE <your ship's call> QTC1 AMVER K'' on 500 kc  
>and you'll get at least one shore station to take your position report.

I would be VERY interested in just how many of this kind of traffic is in  
manual morse CW. Not that that has anything to do with the discussion.  
Just curious.

Jeff, what was your experience back when you were in? And what year did  
you leave? Might be a nice 'intellectual exersize'.

>I've started including a 'reply-to' in the header with my corrected

>address so those wishing to to reply via email will not have problems.

Where have I heard this before..... ; -)

Great idea Jeff. Thank you. Not that I need it NH6IL is an alias on  
amcomp. Well, on my account anyway. ; -)

Dan N8PKV

--

"We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of  
ordinary Americans.." -- President William Jefferson Clinton

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #454

\*\*\*\*\*